

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA  
ATLANTA DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	:	
	:	
v.	:	
	:	CRIMINAL ACTION NO.
IVAN DEXTER CHAPMAN,	:	1:06-CR-470-1-RWS-JFK
	:	
Defendant.	:	

**ORDER**

This matter is before the Court on the Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Janet F. King [Doc. No. 55]. No objections have been filed thereto, but Defendant has filed a Notice of Appeal [Doc. No. 57]. The Court has considered the issues raised in the Notice of Appeal as objections to the Report and Recommendation. The Court will now review the Report and Recommendation to ensure a clear appellate record.

In reviewing a Report and Recommendation, the district court “shall make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). “Parties filing objections to a magistrate’s report and recommendation must specifically identify those findings objected to. Frivolous, conclusive, or general objections need

not be considered by the district court.” United States v. Schultz, 565 F.3d 1353, 1361 (11th Cir. 2009) (quoting Marsden v. Moore, 847 F.2d 1536, 1548 (11th Cir. 1988)) (internal quotation marks omitted). Absent objection, the district judge “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings and recommendations made by the magistrate [judge],” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), and “need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record” in order to accept the recommendation. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72, advisory committee note, 1983 Addition, Subdivision (b). In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Rule 72 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Court has conducted a *de novo* review of those portions of the R&R to which Plaintiff objects and has reviewed the remainder of the R&R for plain error. See United States v. Slay, 714 F.2d 1093, 1095 (11th Cir. 1983).

Defendant’s objections are hereby OVERRULED, and the Report and Recommendation [Doc. No. 55] is approved and adopted as the opinion and order of this Court. As such, the Motion to Vacate [Doc. No. 54] is DENIED, and a Certificate of Appealability is also DENIED. The Clerk is DIRECTED to close the civil action, 1:17-CV-1907.

SO ORDERED this 6th day of July, 2017.



---

<sup>2</sup> **RICHARD W. STORY**  
United States District Judge